

contact with the first surface of a second electrode. Neither Ogura nor Aziz disclose this feature.

For example, using the rejection of claim 1 for illustrative purposes, the Office Action asserts that Ogura discloses an electroluminescent device having a second electrode 209 disposed over electroluminescent layers where the second electrode has a first surface. See Fig. 2 of Ogura. The Office Action then asserts that Ogura discloses a barrier layer 210 that has a second surface which includes an inorganic compound such as silicon nitride or silicon oxide. See Fig. 2 and col. 7, lines 44-47 of Ogura. The Office Action then asserts that Aziz discloses a device with a second electrode 830 having an additional layer including inorganic materials such as silicon oxide or silicon dioxide. See Fig. 15 and col. 5, lines 61-67, col. 6, lines 1-2 of Aziz. The Office Action then concludes that the combination of these references discloses a second electrode having a first surface including an inorganic oxide and a barrier layer having a second surface including an inorganic compound where the second surface of the barrier layer is in direct contact with the first surface of the second electrode.

However, as explained during the October 30 interview, Aziz discloses an additional layer forming the inorganic oxide. This layer is not part of the second electrode but rather an insulating layer. Therefore the alleged second surface of the barrier layer is not in direct contact with the alleged first surface of the second electrode. By contrast, claim 1 recites "the second surface of the barrier layer being in direct contact with the first surface of the second electrode." Therefore, neither Aziz nor Ogura disclose or suggest the recited features of the independent claims.

Additionally, as discussed during the October 30 interview, Ogura discloses a second electrode 209, which covers only the upper faces of the electroluminescent layers 207. See Fig. 2 of Ogura. By contrast, dependent claim 3 recites "the second electrode covering

side faces and upper faces of the electroluminescent layers." Therefore, Ogura does not disclose or suggest the recited features of dependent claim 3. Accordingly, for at least the reasons stated above, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 3, 22-24, and 2, 4-12 depending from claim 1, is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-12 and 22-24 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Stephen J. Pachol  
Registration No. 62,487

JAO:SJP/kjl

Date: November 19, 2008

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 320850**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

|  |
|--|
| <b>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE<br/>AUTHORIZATION</b><br>Please grant any extension<br>necessary for entry;<br>Charge any fee due to our<br>Deposit Account No. 15-0461 |
|--|